DUAL LANGUAGE

—AND—

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A SPEECH

DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS,

—ON—

FEBRUARY 12th, 1890,

—BY—

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN, M.P.

REGINA:
PRINTED BY THE LEADER COMPANY (LIMITED.)

1890.

1890

(11)

22257

Dual Language and Federal Government:

A SPEECH DELIVERED IN THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS, ON FEBRUARY 12, 1890,

BY

NICHOLAS FLOOD DAVIN, M.P.

Mr. McCARTHY moved second reading of Bill (No. 10) to further amend the Revised Statutes of Canada, chapter 50, respecting the North-West Territories.

Mr. DAVIN moved in amendment:

That this Bill be not now read the second time, but that it be resolved, That it is expedient that the Legislative Assembly of the North-West Territories be authorized to deal with the subject of this Bill by Ordinance or enactment, after the next general election for the said Territories.

He said: This, Sir, is after all, a North-West question; but I need hardly say that I am quite aware that it is the privilege, and even the duty, of every member of this House to concern himself with any public question whatsoever; and I congratulate the North-West that my hon. and learned friend (Mr. McCarthy) has taken a tardy interest in our welfare. I am not aware that he ever took a very great interest in our welfare until very lately. He himself tells us that he sat in this House time and again when this measure was before it, and that he actually did not know that the 110th clause existed until the spring of last year. Well, in an ordinary member that would be an extraordinary thing, but in a distinguished advocate it is a marvellous thing indeed. But I think I understand why it is that he has taken this interest in us in the North-West. We had here a question last year which I do not intend to go into at present, but which has been agitated throughout the country in a manner that I do not think was either edifying or statesmanlike; and I rather think that my hon. and learned friend discovered that, on that question, he had taken an illogical stand, that he found, after defending his position for a considerable time, that the position was indefensible, and in order to let himself down easy, he took up questions that would have been settled in the Territories without his aid or the aid of anybody else outside of those Territories. Now, this speech, to which I had not the honour of listening ——

Mr. McCARTHY. Hear, hear.

Mr. DAVIN. I happened to be in Hamilton at the time, under more auspicious circumstances, but I have read that speech carefully, and the remarkable thing about it is that it is one of a series illustrating the law of evolution, because they go on bit by bit, they repeat themselves considerably, but still at each step, my hon. and learned friend shows that the doctrine of Darwin is applicable even to great politicians, and he illustrates the law of evolution. I said a moment ago that I had not the honour of hearing that speech, but, Sir, I had the honour of

reading his speech that had been delivered in Ottawa, a speech going over the same ground. It was, after all, the same old stuff, but with a little evolution. So that, although I did not hear the speech I am tolerably familiar with my hon. friend's opinions on these subjects, and I may say that in the course of a pretty long political life, in the sense that I have been studying politics all my life, and have had an opportunity of hearing most politicians in England and Canada, and prominent politicians in France, I have never met with speeches so wanting in logic from so distinguised a man. Those speeches have two peculiar characteristics. The one is that my hon. and learned friend has taken to dilating on questions that, from his busy life, he was evidently not conversant with, and I am sorry to say that from a somewhat cold manner he has lapsed into violent appeals to passions that can do nothing but harm. Now, Sir, this question is a local one, and for that reason I consider that it should be dealt with by the Local Legislature. Some French gentlemen have gone in there, because we have had a small French immigration—some of our most useful citizens are French gentlemen. They have come there with much wealth, and one of them is a chicory grower. This House will probably be surprised to hear that Canada has become a coffee-growing country. We have in the North-West chicory plantations at the present minute, and when my hon. and learned friend next goes to the North-West, we shall be able to regale him with a cup of coffee, if nothing better, before he dilates on his favourite topics.

Mr. CHAPLEAU. French coffee?

Mr. DAVIN. Oh, that would not agree with my hon. friend. (Laughter.) Well, Sir, the view that I take is this and it is a view that I have taken here twice in regard to the second homestead, I say that if that law is on the Statute-book, a French gentleman who has gone into the North-West under that 110th clause has no right to see it repealed without his having something to say. We have a large population along the Saskatchewan, we have a French population to the south, and although they are greatly outnumbered, the bare fact of their being outnumbered is a reason why, without a hearing, we should not repeal this clause. Now, as I said, this speech is a part of a series. I will say that on some subjects in which I am conversant my hon. and learned friend has laid down some most extraordinary propositions, and among others one which I will deal with presently, that the North-West has been a losing game to us. Here is a proposition that he states:—

"There is no such thing as a Celtic skull."

I must not say Keltic, although I have been trained at the university to say Keltic; still, I remember that the last time that I spoke and used the word Keltic, an hon. gentleman who is a Scotchman, and a friend of mine, asked me, "What on earth are you talking about Keltic the whole time?" So I must not use the word with a k, but with a soft c, and say Celtic.

"There is no such thing as a Celtic skull any more than a Saxon skull; no such thing as Celtic hair any more than Saxon hair; it is only ——"

Mark the proposition he lays down.—

"It is only by language and by the community of language that men are formed into nations."

Now, let me make this remark. He says there is no such thing as a Celtic skull or a Saxon skull. I suppose there is no such thing as a Jewish skull or an Aztec skull; and yet I have read some very scientific treatises in which I have seen the differences in skulls pointed out. Again he says:

"It is plain that what makes a nation is language, and therefore when one speaks of a race, as these distinguished writers have done, one means a community speaking the same language."

Now, I will explain how my hon. friend has fallen into such a proposition as this.

He has read treatises on language, especially as it affects modern thought; and it is rather—I do not like to say it, I do not like to say that he did not understand it, because it would be impolite, and I could not be impolite—but I will say this, that he is so busy a man that he has no time to inform himself properly, and perhaps he is too much of a *nisi prius* advocate to be accurate, and too much of a mere lawyer to be a statesman. (Great laughter and cheers.) But remember the two propositions that he lays down. The first proposition is, that language makes the race and the nation; and as you may have seen in his speech delivered at Ottawa, he lays down the proposition that with diversity of language to make a nation is impossible. Now, the important thing about that proposition is this: It is sent broadcast into ignorant ears, and if that last proposition is true we may despair of Canada. (Hear, hear, from Sir John Macdonald.) That is the important thing about these hurried deductions from superfical studies. My hon. friend, in his Ottawa speech and in the speech delivered in the House, also, talks about making this a British colony. Sir, is not this a British colony? Let us be just. Why is it a British colony? It is so because of that very Lower Canadian French race that seems to act like a red rag on a bull on the mind of my hon. friend; for we know this very well, that there was a time in the history of Canada when that race had just passed over to the British flag, when temptations were held out to them to join the thirteen colonies, and if they had not been true to their new-found allegiance, if their loyalty had not been impregnable against the seductions of Franklin and others, we would have had no British colony here to-day. (Cheers.) Let us be just, if my hon. friend cannot be generous. I will say this, because I want to help my hon. friend. My hon. friend does not profess, he says, to be a very devout man, but still he complains bitterly that the Roman Catholic Church is tolerated in a manner in this country that our laws hardly permit. That is his language, addressed to ignorant and passionate ears. I have the documents here if it is dared to be questioned. That, I say, is the language addressed by the hon. gentleman to ignorant and passionate ears. In these speeches, history is gone over, it is mourned over that certain things were not done in the past, and it is mourned that certain things were not done when the French Canadians numbered only 60,000. But does any man in his senses suppose that, if they had not been dealt with with that wisdom, moderation and generosity that England has dealt out to all races with which she has come in contact in building up her colonial Empire, we should have a British colony here to-day? I want to help my hon. friend. In the intervals of a busy life he is undertaking a crusade against a million and a half of people; because it is a crusade, and he is undertaking a crusade against the Catholic Church. Nobody supposes that I have any leaning to that church. I am a Radical on religious subjects—that is to say, I am a very low English Churchman.

Some Hon. Members. Oh! Oh!

Mr. DAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I am addressing a lawyer mainly, and I am addressing a legislative assembly, and everybody knows that, according to the old Roman law, I can become an English churchman by adoption; so I have become one by adoption. I want to help my hon. friend, because I have devoted some time to the study of history. I tell him that no assault from outside, no matter how great, no catapults that have been brought against that church from outside have ever done it the least harm. The only harm that ever came to that church has been from volcanic eruptions from

within, and then the overflowings have carried away some of her fairest possessions. (Cheers.) So that I help my hon. friend. I tell him this: the way to strengthen the Catholic Church is to assail it, and the way to solidify and make French Canadians united—and I do not think the French Canadian is a very objectionable person, for some of the most charming men and most intelligent men I ever met were French Canadians—but still, as my hon. friend, with his superior culture, does not like them, I may tell him that if he wants to make the French Canadian permanent and the French language enduring, the way to do it is to put the backs of the people up by such assaults as he is making throughout the country. To show that I am speaking by the book, let me read some passages here. I forgot, when dealing with the race question, to read a sentence in which my hon. friend says:

"They will gradually or rapidly, as he hoped, adopt English methods and English ways of thought, and this country will be, as it ought to be, an Anglo-Saxon community."

Fancy speaking to a popular audience like this:

"We came together; we assembled in a common Parliament: but by the skilful direction of the French-Canadian vote, and the desire for power among the English, and consequent division among them, the French Canadians were ultimately able to place their feet on our necks and impose laws on us contrary to our will"

I think myself it is not too much to say that, for a man of my learned friend's experience as a statesman, it is a pretty monstrous thing, in view of his high position in Canada, to have addressed language like that to any audience. How did he tell them he intended to move this Bill? I confess the eloquence surprised me; because, although I had often heard my hon. friend in this House and elsewhere, I did not think that lyric rapture was his forte. This is the way he described it:

"And I have undertaken the task—and a more glorious task I never undertook—(loud cheers)—that I shall be the mover of that Bill."

To be the mover of a Bill of one clause, when there was no danger, no guns pointed at my hon. friend, and to describe that as the most glorious task in his life leads me to wonder what was the character of the other glorious tasks he performed. The only comparison I can think of is this: I once called on a college friend of mine who had married for money a wife who was somewhat old, and he said to me when I was leaving at night, "What do you think of her, Davin?" "Well, Jack," I said, "I wish I had known your taste, for I think I could have got you something older than that." (Great laughter.) Well, Sir, if I had known the hon. gentleman's taste was in that direction I think I could have got him at least as glorious a task. (Cheers.) Why, Sir, when I read that, I remembered a joke of my right hon. friend the Premier the other day. That right hon. gentleman, speaking of the member for Victoria (Mr. Earle,) said, with his usual ready wit, that we were better off in this House than the House of Commons in England, for we had an "earl" amongst us. When I read that glorious statement of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. McCarthy,) I thought we were better off still, for we have a hero in this House—a hero who chants his own epic, and there he sits. (Great laughter and cheers.) I say, Sir, that there is no foundation whatever for these propositions laid down by my hon. friend (Mr. McCarthy), and I will prove that these propositions are false and misleading, and that, therefore, for a statesman as my friend is, and for a man of great influence and popular power to disseminate those fallacies throughout the country, is a very great crime and a very great misdemeanor at the bar of history. I would not care in the least what he proposed to do if he did not fall into such fallacies, misleading as they are and calculated to beget ideas which may tend indeed to the disruption of this country. Now, Sir, I will prove

that there is not a tittle of foundation for his arguments. My hon. friend, when he was making his speech on this subject in the House, resorted to authority. It was a very natural thing for a lawyer to do, yet I may say this, that what I should expect from a statesman would be "reasoning" on this question. I should expect from him that he would reason this question from historical facts; and the historical facts bearing on it are numerous enough. I should expect to see him reasoning from the existing political phenomena in Europe, and then I should expect that he would draw deductions. But what does my hon. and learned friend do? He comes to us with authorities like a lawyer going before a court of appeal, and what, let me ask, are his authorities?—magazine articles, and some of them written by trumpery writers whose names will not even go down the gutter of time. Now, the hon. gentleman might have gone to many existing countries for a parallel. He might have gone especially to Switzerland. My hon. friend from Bothwell (Mr. Mills) suggested Switzerland, and then my hon. and learned friend (Mr. McCarthy) interjected the remark, "The French language is an exception in Switzerland." What the meaning of that observation is I do not know. How is it an exception in Switzerland? The only meaning of that utterance of my hon. friend would be that the language was exceptionally used in that federal state. Why, Sir, there are only three federal states that I know of: Canada, the United States and Switzerland, and in two of these the French is an official language. Let me say that Canada need not be ashamed to go to Switzerland for instruction. There is scarcely a country which my reading makes me acquainted with so calculated to inspire interest and so full of historical incidents that are imperishable. The development of that country has been extraordinary. The differences in its formation, its elevations, its soil and its climate are great and varied; and although Canada stretches across an entire continent, and Switzerland is in the heart of Europe, hemmed in by mighty empires, sometimes in great danger, often menaced, fought with by more powerful nations, yet like the milk-white hind of Dryden,—

"Oft doomed to death, but fated not to die."

The commerce of that country at present exceeds *per capita* the commerce of any country in Europe. Her imports are about $150,000,000, and her exports, I think, $140,000,000. Notwithstanding the difference I have spoken of, we know, Sir, that there is an analogy between Canada and Switzerland in the produce of our dairies, in the produce of our cornfields, in our mighty forests, and even in our Alpine scenery, which, if any of you have visited, you know that it need not blush even in the face of Mont Blanc. (Cheers.) There is a remarkable physical analogy between the countries and when you come to compare the systems of government there is a more remarkable analogy still. The very same questions that are relegated to the Provinces in Canada are relegated to the Cantons in Switzerland; and the very same questions that are relegated to the Federal Government in Canada are relegated to the Federal Government in Switzerland which meets at Berne. How many languages have you in the Parliament at Berne? Why, Sir, five language can be spoken there, and three of these are official. I am not saying that I approve of this. I am only stating facts from which deductions can be drawn. But here is my hon. friend, a statesman that might be a Gamaliel to me, at whose feet I ought to sit; here is my hon. and learned friend dilating on this question and telling us, in the face of the fact that Switzerland has endured since the 12th century, that it is the oldest republic that ever existed,

that its people are contented and prosperous ; that she is a prosperous manufacturing country, and does not every one of us know what admirable articles they manufacture there?—yet, in face of the fact that that prosperous nation has three official languages, my hon. and learned friend goes abroad and tells the people that if there are two official languages in this country we can never hope to make a nation, that we may throw up the sponge and write "Ichabod" over our country. A mere statement of the fact without any argument to support it is a *reductio ad absurdum*. My hon. and learned friend tells us that you cannot have a nation unless you have only one official language. Well, thereby hangs a tale, and I think the tale I am about to unfold will be a political caudal appendage which will cling to my hon. friend for a long time. (Laughter.) You know, Sir, that when the hon. gentleman spoke in this House a short time ago, he gave us the authority of Professor Freeman, who he said was a great man. Now, I will give you the same authority, which the hon. gentleman read, and if you will excuse me I will read it out of the book which bears the sacred mark of my hon. and learned friend. It reads :

"And now having ruled that races and nations, though largely formed by the working of an artificial law, are still real and living things, groups in which the idea of kindred is the idea around which everything has grown, how are we to define our races and our nations? How are we to mark them off one from the other? Bearing in mind the cautions and qualifications which have been already given, bearing in mind large classes of exceptions which will presently be spoken of, I say unhesitatingly that for practical purposes there is one test, and one only, and that test is language. We may at least apply the test negatively. It might be unsafe to rule that all speakers of the same language have a common nationality, but we may safely say that, where there is not community of language, there is no common nationality in the highest sense. As in the teeth of community of language there may be what for all political purposes are separate nations, so without community of language there may be an artificial nationality, a nationality which may be good for all political purposes, and which may engender a common national feeling ; still, this is not quite the same thing as that fuller national unity which is felt where there is community of language. In fact, mankind instinctively takes language as the badge of nationality. We so far take it as the badge that we instinctively assume community of language in a nation as the rule, and we set down anything that departs from that rule as an exception. The first idea suggested by the word Frenchman, or German, or any other national name, is that he is a man who speaks French or German as his mother tongue. We take for granted, in the absence of anything to make us think otherwise, that a Frenchman is a speaker of French, and that a speaker of French is a Frenchman."

My hon. friend comments on that :

"I think that will not be denied as a correct doctrine."

And, of course, what he appears to make out is this : that the teaching of that article is the teaching he had laid down in his proposition, that it was necessary to have community of language in order to have a nation. I cannot believe that my hon. friend meant to deceive this House, and therefore I am thrown back on the alternative, that he did not understand Freeman. That article, Sir, does not deal with the question my hon. friend tried to make the House think it dealt with. Freeman takes for his text the extraordinary circumstance of a lot of Magyars going to Constantinople to congratulate an Ottoman general on a victory on the ground of their kinship ; because, as you know, the Magyar is a form of the same Semitic speech, if it be Semitic, as is spoken by the Turks. He does the same thing as Max Muller ; he deals with an extraordinary phenomenon in modern life, brought about by a strong bent to philological studies ; for people are giving in this late day an importance to language that was not given before ; and when you read the article, you will find that Freeman uses the word "exceptions" in an extraordinary way. He actually uses the word for the majority, and why does he do it ? Because he lays down this proposition : that there are now certain nations which are formed on this idea, but he says the exceptions all over Europe are very large. Now, if the House will bear with me I will give them an idea of this article ; but, first, let me ask why did not my hon. friend read on ? You will see in a minute.

If he had gone on, he would have read that all the larger countries of Europe provide us with exceptions—England, France, Germany, Italy, even Austria. Freeman points out that there are islands which both speech and geographical position seem to mark out as French, but which are English—as truly English, as truly devoted to England, as truly a part of the British Empire in feeling, as the people of London. I allude to the people of the Channel Isles, men of the same blood precisely and coming from the same district of France as the French Canadians. They are, I will say, as true to England, I believe, as the French Canadians are to Confederation. Why? Freeman asks. Because circumstances led them to cleave to England though their kindred in Normandy became French; and one again and again sees in the article—which I hope my hon. and learned friend did not read—that circumstances control more than language. The insular Norman, though speaking French, did not become a Frenchman, and he is to-day a loyal part of the British nation speaking French.

"These instances," says Freeman, "and countless others, bear out the position, that while community of language is the most obvious sign of common nationality, while it is the main element, or something more than an element, in the formation of a nationality, the rule is open to exceptions of all kinds, and the influence of language is at all times liable to be overruled by other influences."

Now, Sir, take Quebec: will any man suppose for one moment that, notwithstanding the mountebank utterances of the present Prime Minister of Quebec, notwithstanding this stuff about the tricolour, and hustings nonsense of that sort, to which nobody pays any attention, and notwithstanding those articles in the press, which my hon. friend thinks controlling—he knows very well that there have been articles in the English press of Canada which if a man were to take as an exponent of the sentiment of the Canadian people he would be regarded as demented—will any man suppose that if Quebec could to-day do what she pleased, she would cut the painter with this country and England, and go over to France? (Cries of "No!" from the French members, and "Never!"). You know very well, from the character of the people, from their political and religious convictions, that they cling to the British flag. Now, Freeman points out that political and other reasons forbade the annexation by Germany of quite a number of countries; and then he comes to those parts of the world where people who are confessedly of different races and language, inhabit a continuous territory and live under the same flag. Then Freeman instances—and, of course, my hon. friend, when quoting Freeman, fought shy of this, which would be all right, you know, before a jury, but it is not right before the jury of the people of Canada—the Swiss Confederation, which he says has what my friend quoted him to prove that it it could not have, namely, a full right to be called a nation in a political sense. (Cheers.)

"It has been formed on a principle directly opposite to the identity of race and language. That Confederation is formed by the union of certain detached fragments of German, Italian and Burgundian nations. German is undoubtedly the language of the great majority of the nation. But the two recognised Romance languages are each the speech of a large minority forming a visible element in the general body. * * * While German, French and Italian are all recognised as national languages by the Swiss Confederation, the independent Romance language which is still used in some parts of the Canton of Graubunden, that which is known specially as Romansch, is not recognised."

Mark his word, in that article:

"It is left in the same position in which Welsh and Gaelic are left in Great Britain, in which Basque, Breton, Provencal, Waldoon and Flemish are left in the borders of that French kingdom, which has grown so as to take them all in."

Now, what does Mr. Freeman say of this Swiss Confederation, which has five languages and three official languages?

"Yet surely," he says, "the Swiss Confederation is a nation. For all political purposes the Swiss Confederation is a nation, one capable of as strong and true national feeling as any other nation."

Yet this man has been quoted to prove that Canada, with two languages, could not be a nation! (Cheers.) May I not apply his language to Canada, and say that surely Canada with her two official languages, if they are to prevail, can surely become a nation. (Renewed cheers.) Then my hon. friend quotes this writer again to prove that identity of speech is necessary to make a nation, and that diversity of language is fatal to the existence of a nation—that two or more official languages are fatal to a nation, and that identity of language and race will alone make one. What does Mr. Freeman say? He says :

"We now come to the other countries in which nationality and language keep the connection which they have elsewhere, but in which nations do not, even in the roughest way, answer to Governments."

Can you have a greater repudiation than that of my hon. friend's theory? (Hear, hear) Here is a language and it in no way answers to the Government that exists.

"In eastern Europe," Mr. Freeman tells us, "a nation's nationality, as marked out by national feeling, has altogether parted company from political government."

And he instances Turkey, Austro-Hungary, Greece, Bulgaria and Servia :

"In all these lands," says he, "there is no difficulty in marking off the several nations—(that is by speech only)—in no case do the nations answer to any existing political power. In these lands, moreover, religion takes the place of nationality. The Christian renegade who embraces Islam becomes a Turk, even though he keep his Greek or Slavonian language. Even the Greek or Armenian who embraces the Latin goes far towards parting with his nationality."

Can anything be plainer than that Mr. Freeman teaches the very contrary of what my hon. friend quoted him to prove? (Hear, hear.) Therefore, I have concluded, because I know my hon. friend is an honourable man, that he did not read the article, or he read it in such a cursory manner that he did not grasp the ideas that inspired it. Well, all I can say is, that if he takes up his knowledge as certain birds take their food, on the wing, it is no wonder why his conclusions should be so flighty. (Laughter and cheers.) My hon. friend comes from the country whence I myself come. Ireland can boast of him amongst her distinguished lawyers. Does identity of language make community of sentiment, community of race, and community of nation there? Why, do we not know that for hundreds of years the Saxon has been denounced in the Saxon tongue? So that there were at my hon. friend's door facts that might have prevented him, if he had the time for reflection, from falling into the errors he has fallen into. Now, I hardly think it worth while to deal with his allusions to Mr. Mercier, his allusions to French newspapers, his quotations from *The Month*—*The Month* he cited as an authority. Why did he quote *The Month* as an authority? "Why," he said, "it was an authority last year, and it ought to be an authority now" ; but if I remember rightly, my hon. and learned friend the Minister of Justice quoted it last year to prove that certain views, which had been quoted from a review by my hon. friend, had not been acknowledged or accepted as the views of a certain section of the Christian Church. That, as I remember, was the way it was used ; but if it was made an authority last year improperly, that would be no reason for repeating the error. Then my hon. friend quoted from the *Catholic World*—to prove what? To prove that the French Canadian is hostile to and is parting company with the English. Well, my hon. friend knows very well a large class—a class for which I have the greatest possible respect; my own blood, I suppose flows in their veins—exists which have not the same regard for England that I have. He knows very well that the people for whom the *Catholic World* is written are people who would like to hear that certain sections of the British Empire were hostile to its flag; and to quote that as an authority seems to me an extraordinary affair.

But, as the hon. gentleman was looking for reviews, there is a review—I do not know whether it came into his hands—which is one of the first reviews of the world. I refer to the *Andover Review*, in which there is an article *ad rem* on this question, an article dealing actually with the question of race in politics, and written by a distinguished man. As we are treating the House to articles from reviews, and as I have the precedent of my hon. and learned friend to guide me, I will tell the House what is stated in this article, written by Horatio Hale, and headed, "Language as a Political Force." On page 175, Mr. Hale says :

"Two or more communities speaking different languages may live in harmony, under one Government when this Government is a federation and each of these communities is allowed to manage freely its own local affairs."

Then on page 176, he says :

"This result will be delayed to some extent by the wisdom which has been shown by the British Government, in not merely granting the utmost possible freedom to its colonies, but in stimulating the exercise by them of the powers of such self-government to the utmost possible extent. This remarkable political sagacity——"

Mark the way he regards the policy of the British Government :

"This remarkable political sagacity, unprecedented heretofore in history, is naturally rewarded by an attachment of the colonies to the mother country, which has been hitherto strong enough to overcome the attraction of a population almost conterminous, speaking the same language and enjoying equally free institutions. If Canada had been governed from England in the manner in which Cuba is governed from Spain, it certainly would now not be a British possession."

Then this same weighty writer says :

"The Swiss Republic is a notable instance of the manner in which communities speaking several different languages can be enabled, by the large application of the method of local self-government, to live in harmony under one general authority, for which, under such a system, all the members of the Confederacy may come to feel an equal and intense attachment."

Then, on page 178, he says :

"The danger to freedom and the constant liability to disturbance which result from the inclusion, in a large population, of a small community, speaking a distinct language, can be removed in only two ways. The one is by the extinction of the separate language, and the complete assimilation of the people who speak it. But this is a slow process, requiring usually several generations, and perhaps some severities hostile to good government. The other, and far prompter and surer mode, is by the application of the method of local self-government in some form."

On page 182 he says :

"France alone, in her domestic policy, seems to have solved the problem and dispelled the peril. Universal suffrage, departmental councils, and equal laws of inheritance, have transformed Germans, Bretons, Basques and Italians into Frenchmen as loyal and devoted to their country as any of their French-speaking compatriots. This is a practical lesson which statesmen of all countries would do well to lay to heart. The strongest and most enduring of bonds is found, not in kindred or in force, but in free institutions and"—

In what ?

—"in equal rights."

(Cheers.)

Now, I say that that article was worth quoting, and much better worth quoting then *The Month* or some obscure French paper. Now I come to a very delicate subject. My hon. and learned friend is taking a deep interest in the North-West, and it is a proverb that we must not look a gift horse in the mouth ; but he tells us here :

"As a matter of dollars and cents, as a matter of mere money, the acquisition of the North-West has been a losing speculation, and, except for the purpose of building up a great nation, which we are willing to do"—

And so on. I tell the hon. member that he has had plenty of evidence on this subject. It has been shown again and again, in this House and elsewhere, that the acquisition of the North-West was not a losing speculation. Is there a man in the country who feels the cost of the Canadian Pacific Railway ? Is there a man in the country who objects to the cost of that railway ?

SIR RICHARD CARTWRIGHT : "Yes."

Except some dreaming pessimists ? (Cheers.) Look at the increased wealth, in the last seven years, of Montreal, look at the increased wealth of Toronto, look at the increased wealth of the manufacturing towns in Ontario, look at the extension of manufactures in Ontario, look at the fact that merchants and manufacturers tell me that the North-West is a magnificent customer to Ontario The hon. gentleman goes on to saying some-

thing about the depreciation in the value of farms. I have looked into the reports of Mr. Bleu, and I know he generally takes a gloomy view of things, but he does not say that the farms of Ontario have depreciated in value. We know that as farms grow old—and they are not always cultivated as they should be here—they cannot be expected to be kept up to their original value. I do not think the utterances of the hon. gentleman on this subject were the utterances of a statesman. Look at the fact that the North-West has been opened up, that we have a vast railway there; that we have farms there to which our children can be sent; that we raise wheat in the North-West, of which I have a specimen here, (holding up a bag) the like of which cannot be produced in any other part of Canada. I have specimens of wheat which have been grown near Regina, Moose Jaw and other parts of the district which I have the honour to represent, and nearly nine-tenths of that wheat have been graded No. 1 Hard. Is not that an acquisition of wealth to this country? (Cheers.) If the hon. gentleman were right, we might apply Horace's illustration to his statement, where he speaks of plucking one hair after another out of a horse's tail. If this country is of no value, of course the more you diminish the size of Canada, by a parity of reasoning, the richer we shall become. This is one of those utterances which, I think, are inexcusable in a man of the hon. gentleman's experience. I have already shown that my hon. friend has been guilty of the most glaring inaccuracy in other points; but he also told the House, in his carefully considered speech, that a newspaper published in the North-West, called, I think—let me see—the Regina LEADER, never said a word about the dual language; that it had been silent upon that subject while other papers had spoken about it. I might refer the hon. gentleman to the issue of that paper of September 10, 1889, and here I find a whole column headed "The Dual Language," from which I will read a few passages to the House:

"It is palpable in a country such as ours, moderation is absolutely necessary in order that it shall develop progress and culminate. If in any province or territory two languages are unnecessary in official work, then the proper thing is to discuss in a calm and collected manner the question whether their use shall be continued or terminated. Mr. Dalton McCarthy in one of his speeches said he did not know that the French language was required by law in these Territories. Yet he was in Parliament in 1877, when Mr. Mills brought in his Bill to amend this Act and, not to be more particular, he was in Parliament, in 1886, when the Revised Statutes were passed, yet he did not know until the early part of last session that such was the law. This throws a remarkable light on the ignorance of eastern politicians regarding the North-West, and might indeed give rise generally to curious reflections. He is evidently not aware that the subject has been discussed among politicians in the North-West, or that had he never raised the question it would be raised here. Everybody acquainted with our leading men knew how the matter stood. Let it be raised, but when raised let us discuss it as statesmen should discuss it, without violent or offensive language. We need hardly say that Mr. McCarthy having sat in Parliament since 1876, having voted on the Revised Statutes, is one of the persons who passed the law in its present state. He is responsible for it. Like every political and administrative question its expediency or the reverse may be properly discussed. If it should be decided that in any part of the Dominion the dual language is not necessary, let it be abolished without excitement or dithyrambics, and *vice versa*.'

I hear one of my hon. friends laughing at the word "dithyrambics," but if he will get a dictionary and look up the word, he will find that it bears a strong application to that speech at Ottawa to which I referred—

"In regard to race questions we say this: in the Dominion of Canada every man is equal before the law, and whatever be his mother tongue, whether he be Celt or Saxon, Celto-Latin or Saxon-Celt, whether he be a Scoto-Indian or Franco-Indian (*Métis*), he stands on the same footing under our constitution before the law, and to try to give the Saxon or the Celt or the Celto-Latin any predominance or to seek to suppress or unjustly repress one or the other would be to take a course contrary to civil liberty and to the constitution which secures equal rights to all. We are in a new country in the North-West, let us make a new start and discuss any question that may arise, not in the deceiving glare of prejudice, but in the clear cold light of reason; nay, in the broad illumination of the Gospel of our Lord, who taught us that all men are brethren. If the continuance of the dual language is to be discussed it should be discussed in the same practical temper, the same absence of excitement, as we would discuss the building of a bridge over Boggy Creek. It is not necessary to be violent or offensive, to rail at this or the other section of the community, but

to take up a question of practical action in a practical manner and looking at it on all sides come to what will have, under such quiet and balanced conditions, a chance of proving a wise conclusion."

The Swiss question is then dealt with. But the fact that my hon. friend, in a carefully prepared speech, could state that THE LEADER had made no reference whatever to this question, shows the glaring inaccuracy that characterised the whole speech. Now, the federal system to which I referred, requires two things. You must first have a body of communities such as we have in Canada, such as they have in the United States, such as they have in Switzerland, and these communities must have a common bond of sentiment. They must desire union but not unity; they must have a loyalty to their State or Province, and at the same time a loyalty to the Federal Government. If, of course, they desired unity, the proper thing would be a central government; but where they desire to come together and get something that will give them the impress of a nation and yet keep autonomous their own State or Province, the proper solution is a Federal Government, and that Federal Government may be called upon to deal with different races, with different languages, with men of different religions, as we see in Switzerland and as we see in Canada. Sir, I consider that here in Canada we have all the conditions that are necessary to produce a strong federal people. In peace, the loyalty to the State or Province will be high. In war, the loyalty to the Federal Government will be high. If Canada were assailed from without to-day you would find that every feeling that is provincial in the breasts of Quebeckers, in the breasts of New Brunswickers, in the breasts of Nova Scotians, in the breasts of the people of the North-West Territories and of British Columbia, would all disappear in the grand federal feeling that they should fight for their common country. Why, Sir, how little language has to do with preventing people from becoming citizens of a country. I have travelled in Alsace-Lorraine where the people speak German. They are now under the German flag, but gladly would they go back. They fought gallantly under the French banner. A more loyal part of France that Alsace-Lorraine did not exist. Then take the Bretons. I saw in the summer of 1870, Gen. Trochu review 300,000 Breton mobiles in the streets of Paris, and there was not a man under the rank of officer who could speak French; yet these men, when the hour of peril came, went into battle and fought just as gallantly and just as eagerly as the men who spoke French. (Cheers.) Now, Sir, heated harangues like these, whose dangers I have exposed to night, I hope will cease. They can reflect no honour on my hon. and learned friend, and I speak with truth when I say that I would be jealous for his honour. There is no position that he could attain, there is no reputation, however bright, that he could make, which would not give me great pleasure. But such harangues as these can reflect no credit on him as a statesman, and they are capable of doing incalculable damage to his country. I, for one, whether we have a dual language or not, have no fear whatever for Canada. I am perfectly certain of Canada's future. History teaches me lessons that history, if he studies it, will teach my hon. and learned friend. Why, Sir, does he know anything of the genesis of nations? Does he know how one country after another has risen, and how they have spoken different languages, and how they have come together, and fought under different banners, and lived under different governments, and gradually become assimilated until the difference of language disappeared, and sometimes a new language was evolved? History will teach my hon.

friend that he can dispel those fears that have tortured his imagination, and with which he has sought to inflame the passions of the people of this country. The main propositions that are behind his speech, I have shown to be absolutely without foundation ; I have shown that the deduction he has drawn from those propositions are fallacious ; I have shown that the authorities that my hon. friend has quoted, and has paraded before this House, actually teach something else ; and I do hope that there is that grandeur of soul in my hon. and learned friend that he can come to the conclusion that he has been in error, and will determine to mend his ways. (Loud and prolonged cheers.)

ERRATA.—On page 6, in second column, instead of lines 31 to 34, read "Because, as you know, the Magyar is a form of the same Turanian speech as is spoken by the Turks."